UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,214	07/25/2006	Germano Leichsenring	2006-1209A	7022

52349   7590   07/06/2009
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.
1030 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER
CHANG, TOM Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2456	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/587,214	LEICHSENRING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	TOM Y. CHANG	2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 May 2009_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 14-19_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 14-19_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

05/26/2009 has been entered. Claims 1, 18 have been amended and claim 2-11 14-17

and 19 remains as previously presented. Claims 1-11, 14-19 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1-5, 8- 11, 14, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Arazi et al US 2001/0041594, hereafter Arazi.

3.   Regarding claim 1, Arazi teaches an access control device **(Figure 2 Base**

Station 124) for controlling an access from a resource use device**(Figure 2 handset**

133)to a resource providing device**(Figure 2 Switch 129)** for using a resource provided

by the resource providing device**(Figure 2 Communication Link 132)**. Arazi teaches

that the access control device controls the communication of the handset and base station **"Communication links 130, 131, 132 connect the Base Stations 123, 124, 125, respectively, with a Central Switch (hereinafter "Switch") 129. These communication links enable the Switch 129 to control the operation of the Base Stations" (Paragraph 74)].** This clearly means that access control device contains a communication unit for communicating with the resource use device and the resource providing device. Arazi teaches an access permission unit for instructing the resource providing device via the communication unit to permit an access from the resource use device and a storage unit for storing information on the resource use device which has been permitted to access by the access permission unit as management information **["If the arriving message is a request to initiate a new call (step 231, "Y"), the Switch checks if the call is intended to a handset connected to the WPBX (step 232). This is done by checking its "Connections Table"." (Paragraph 103)].** It is clear that in order to access this connections table the access control device must have some form of memory to store the information. Arazi teaches that the switch also serves as an existence check unit for checking a communication state with the resource use device the management information of which is stored in the storage unit, via the communication unit; **["The Switch checks if it receives indication that the call is connected (step 255). If the call is connected, (step 255, "Y"), the status of the call is updated in the Calls Table (step 256). Otherwise (step 255, "N"), the call is removed from the Calls Table (step 257)." (Paragraph 102)]** and an access discard unit for instructing the resource providing device via the communication unit to reject an

access from the resource use device, communication with which is determined to be

disconnected by the existence check unit.

> **["If the connection via the Gateway succeeds (step 236, "N"), it is
> whether the call is connected determined (step 237). If the call is
> connected, (step 237, "Y"), the Switch requests from the originating
> Base Station to transfer the call to the Switch (step 238), and waits
> for connection with originating Base Station (steps 239, 240). If
> connection succeeds, and the call is connected (step 242, "Y"), the
> call is added to the "Calls Table" (step 243), and the call is routed to
> the Gateway (step 244). If connection fails (step 240, "Y"; or step
> 242, "N"), the connection with the Gateway is disconnected (step
> 241). (Paragraph 104)]**

Regarding the limitation that the access control device is in direct communication to the

resource use device and resource providing device, Arazi also teaches direct

communication with the resource use device and resource providing device (¶81

describes that the switch could be implemented as part of one base station. The

combined Switch/base station communicates directly with the handsets in its

coverage area and communicates directly with other bases stations to connect a

call to a handset service by another wbpx base station).

4.   Regarding claim 10, Arazi teaches a communication unit for communicating with

the access control device and the resource use device **["FIG. 5 illustrates a call setup**

procedure performed by an originating Base Station (e.g. 123) when a handset

(e.g., 121) that is connected to it, tries to initiate a call." (Paragraph)] . It is clear

that in order to perform this call setup procedure the resource providing device contains

a communication unit. Arazi teaches that the base station uses a Base Station

Connection Table **["In a next step 152, the originating Base Station (e.g., 123)**

checks whether the destination handset (e.g., 133) is in its "Base Station

Connection Table""" (Paragraph 83)]. This clearly indicates that there must be some

storage unit for storing information on the resource use device intended by an

instruction given by the access control device via the communication unit as

management information. Arazi teaches an access permission unit for permitting an

access from the resource use device, the management information of which is stored in

the storage unit

> **["If, there is not a timeout (step 166, "N"), and a reply from the**
> **destination Base Station is received, the originating Base Station**
> **checks if the call is connected (step 167), and then connects the**
> **originating handset (step 168), and updates the Switch about the**
> **success of the call (step 169)." (Paragraph 85)]**

Arazi teaches an existence check unit for checking a communication state with the

access control device via the communication unit

> **["If, there is not a timeout (step 166, "N"), and a reply from the**
> **destination Base Station is received, the originating Base Station**
> **checks if the call is connected (step 167), and then connects the**
> **originating handset (step 168), and updates the Switch about the**
> **success of the call (step 169)." (Paragraph 85)]**

 and an access rejection unit for rejecting an access from the resource use device

permitted to access by the access control device, communication with which is

determined to be disconnected by the existence check unit

> **["Then the originating Base Station performs a procedure similar to**
> **that described hereinabove of setting a timeout (step 155), waiting**
> **for the Switch to reply (step 156), connecting (step 158) or**
> **disconnecting (step 177) the call, and updating the Switch (steps 159**
> **or 178)." (Paragraph 88)]**

 Arazi teaches that the information on the resource use device includes information for

identifying the resource use device and information for identifying the access control

10587214

device which has permitted the resource use device to access**["Send new connection information (handset ID, Base Station ID, handle to low-level protocol instance) to Switch" (Paragraph 304)]**.The switch tells the base station to reject access by not replying to the base state by the time the timeout period ends**(Figure 7 Step 236)**. The switch also tells the base station to store the connection information by virtue of allowing the call to connect**(reply before timeout)** ie sending back the destination base station in the case that the call must be routed to another base station **(¶105).**

5.   Regarding claim 18, most of the limitations in claim 18 have already been discussed as they are covered by the discussion of claims 1 and 10, above. Furthermore Arazi teaches the limitation of claim 18 that recites an access from the resource use device intended by the instruction given by the access control device via the resource providing communication unit.

> **["If the source is another Base Station, the Switch send to the originating Base Station the address of the destination Base Station, and adds the call to the "Calls Table". If the call arrived from the Gateway the Switch tries to connect the call to the destination Base Station (step 245). If is succeeds the call is added to the "Calls Table" (step 252), the call is transferred to the destination (step 253). If it fails the connection with the Gateway is disconnected."**
> **(Paragraph 105)]**

By not replying to the base station the switch instructs the base station to reject the call **(Figure 7 Steps 240,241)**. The switch also tells the base station to store the connection information by virtue of allowing the call to connect**(reply before timeout)** ie sending back the destination base station in the case that the call must be routed to another base station **(¶105).**

Regarding the limitation that the access control device is in direct communication to the resource use device and resource providing device, Arazi also teaches direct communication with the resource use device and resource providing device (**¶81 describes that the switch could be implemented as part of one base station. The combined Switch/base station communicates directly with the handsets in its coverage area and communicates directly with other bases stations to connect a call to a handset service by another wbpx base station).**

6.   Regarding claims 2 and 11, Arazi teaches that the access discard unit deletes the information on the resource use device, communication with which is determined to be disconnected, from the storage unit. Arazi teaches that this is done for both the resource control device **["The Switch checks if it receives indication that the call is connected (step 255). If the call is connected, (step 255, "Y"), the status of the call is updated in the Calls Table (step 256). Otherwise (step 255, "N"), the call is removed from the Calls Table (step 257) (Paragraph 102)],** and the resource provding device **["Send new connection information (handset ID, Base Station ID, handle to low-level protocol instance) to Switch" (Paragraph 304)].**

7.   Regarding claims 3 and 4 Arazi teaches wherein the information on the resource use device is information for identifying the resource use device and information for identifying the resource providing device for accepting an access from the resource use device..

> **["The Switch (129) maintains the "Calls Table", which contains the status and information about all the active calls being handled by the WPBX. The "Calls Table" comprises the following information:" (Paragraph 111)]**

["4) "Calling Number Identification (CNID)", the number of the calling party, if available." (Paragraph 115)]
["6) "Originating Base Station Identification" for calls from internal origin" (Paragraph 117)]

8.   Regarding claims 5, 14 and 19, Arazi teaches the information on the resource use device includes information on a command issued by the resource use device when accessing the resource providing device**(Figure 5 Step 151) ["In summary, the call setup procedure performed by an originating Base Station (e.g., 123) is that, first, the originating Base Station determines whether a call request from an originating handset" (Paragraph 89)]**

9.   Regarding claim 8, Arazi teaches an existence check response unit for responding to the resource providing device via the communication unit when receiving a communication state check request from the resource providing device via the communication unit **["Switch checks if it receives indication that the call is connected (step 255). If the call is connected, (step 255, "Y"), the status of the call is updated in the Calls Table (step 256). Otherwise (step 255, "N"), the call is removed from the Calls Table (step 257)." (Paragraph 102)]**

10.   Regarding claims 9, and 17 Arazi teaches an access control device according to claim 1, wherein: the communication unit communicates with the resource use device via wireless communication **["As used herein, "Mobile Units" are devices communicating wirelessly with (also referred to as "connected to") Base Stations." (Paragraph 69)]**. The switch is connected to the base station also by wireless links **["These communication links enable the Switch 129 to control the**

operation of the Base Stations and to participate in the higher levels of the

communication protocols, as described in greater detail hereinbelow, and may be

RF links or land lines" (Paragraph 74)]. Wireless communication inherently has a

limited range and thus Arazi clearly teaches the communication range by the wireless

communication is limited to a predetermined range.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 6, 7, 15, and16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Arazi as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Xu et al

6,151,628, hereafter Xu..

13.   Regarding claim 6, Arazi teaches all the limitation of claim1 above. Arazi does

not teach that the access permission unit notifies the resource providing device of the

information on the resource use device to be permitted to access. Xu teaches that the

access permission unit notifies the resource providing device of the information on the

resource use device to be permitted to access, via the communication unit **(Figure 6**

Access Reply 104). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Arazi with Xu. The reason for this

modification would be to provide information needed by the resource providing device

so that a connection can be made between the resource use device and another device

on the network.

14.   Regarding claims 7 and 15, the teaching of Arazi have been discussed in

reference to claims 1 and 10 above. Arazi does not teach that the access control device

sends information to the resource providing device to indicate that the access should be

denied. Xu teaches that the access discard unit notifies the resource providing device of

the information on the resource use device, communication with which is determined to

be disconnected, and when instructed by the access control device via the

communication unit to reject an access from the resource use device, the access

rejecting unit rejects an access from the resource use device intended by the

instruction**(Figure 8 Access-Reject Message)** [**"When the authentication server 32A**

determines hat the remote user is not authorized, an Access-Reject message is

sent from the authentication server 32 to the communications chassis 20"

(Column 12 Lines 35-38)]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to modify Arazi's teachings with that of Xu. The

reason for this modification would be to inform the resource providing device when it

should deny connecting a call because the resource use device does no have the right

credentials. By not replying to the base station the switch instructs the base station to

reject the call **(Figure 7 Steps 240,241)**.

15.   Regarding claim 16, Arazi teaches the access rejecting unit deletes the

information on the resource use device intended by the instruction from the storage unit

["Remove connection from "Base Station Connections Table"." (Paragraph 308)].

Relevant Art Cited By The Examiner

16.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

US 7,281,264 - Security system and method for PnP device coupled to network client.

US 2005/0138179 -Techniques for limiting network access.

Applicant's Arguments

17.   The applicant argues the following in the remarks section of the applicant's reply:

        a.   Claim 1 is allowable because the prior art of reference Arazi, does not

        teach that the communication unit directly communicates with the resource use

        device and resource providing device.

        b.   Arazi does not teach instructing the resource providing device via the

        communication unit to permit an access from the resource use device, because

        the handset has already accessed the base station in order to initiate a call

        request.

c.   Arazi does not teach instructing the resource providing device via the

communication unit to reject an access from the resource use device, because

the timeouts taught by Arazi do not constitute an instruction.

d.   Claim 10 is allowable because the switch described by Arazi does not

store information based on an instruction given by a switch.

18.   Regarding a, the specification does not describe direct communication between

the access control device and both the resource providing device and resource use

device. While Figure 1 and its associated description(¶46 -49 of publication

2007/0162674) can be inferred to describe direct communication it is clear that the

applicant's invention is not limited to such an arrangement(see ¶47 that the

communication links can be via internet which is not direct since it can go through

internet routers/gateways). Therefore although it is not 100% certain that the applicant

intended the idea of direct communication to be a limiting element of the invention the

examiner affords enabling disclosure for the direct communication limitation.

Regardless, Arazi teaches in ¶81 that the switch is implemented as part of one of the

base stations. In this case the switch/base station serves as the switch and is in direct

communication with the handsets in the switch's coverage area. The switch

communicates directly with other bases stations or other networks(PBX PSTN, LAN

gateways) which are resource providing devices . Therefore Arazi teaches direction

communication between the access control device and both the resource use and

resource providing device.

19.   Regarding b, while it is true that a handset needs to have some sort of initial

connection with the base station, the claim as recited simply describes that the access

permission unit instructs the resource providing device to permit "an access". The

initial connection request made by the handset is a connection request and does not

constitute true access being granted until a connection is made that provides the

handset with a resource(connection another handset, PBX, PSTN telephone, internet).

20.   Regarding c, the examiner still holds that a using a timeout correctly describes

and instruction from the switch to reject access from the resource use device at the

resource providing device. The claim does not specify any details as to how this

instruction is performed. The timeout informs the base station that when the timeout

expires and no contradicting commands are sent from the switch (to complete a

connection) then the base station is to assume the instruction from the switch is to

reject the access. Even if the applicant were to further specify the instruction being in

the form of a command/message, such a command/message would have been obvious

in light of Arazi teaching of a stop communication command in ¶21.

21.   Regarding d, when a call is initiated and no timeout occurs the switch replies with

the destination base station's address. Receiving this destination address informs the

originating base station the destination address of the base station(or IP address in the

case that the requested destination resources is the internet) so that the originating

base station can establish a connection to the destination base station and eventually to

a receiving handset. Receiving the destination address from the a switch is correctly

construed as an instruction to save management information because when the

originating base station receives the destination address it has all the information to

update a connection table record with data that describes the details of a connection(i.e.

who is connected to who and using which base stations) This data must inherently be

updated, otherwise the call would not be able to be completed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to TOM Y. CHANG whose telephone number is (571)270-

5938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit, can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/T. Y. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2456
06/25/2009

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456